DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 168 JC 900 567

AUTHOR Brootkowski, Julia R.
TITLE Community College Reentry Programs: What Does the Future Hold?
PUB DATE Jun 89
NOTE 33p.; Field study project, University of California, Davis.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Students; Ancillary School Services; *Community Colleges; Demography; Educational Trends; Feminism; Program Descriptions; *Reentry Students; Special Needs Students; Student Characteristics; *Student Personnel Services; Two Year Colleges; Women Administrators; *Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

In an effort to better understand the history, current status, and future direction of special programs for reentry students, a study was conducted of reentry programs at three California community colleges (i.e., San Jose City College, De Anza College, and Yuba College). The colleges were chosen to represent urban, suburban, and rural locales and different student populations (i.e., primarily middle-income white, ethnically diverse, and working-class white). Their reentry programs had been in operation since the early 1970's, and all had a reputation for success. Interviews were conducted with reentry program administrators and faculty affiliated with the programs. Study findings included the following: (1) all of the programs began in the late 1960's as women's centers or educational outreach programs for particular groups, such as low-income women, displaced homemakers, single mothers, or a combination of these; (2) one of the major changes witnessed by all programs was a shift from a feminist orientation as a women's center to a program accommodating both men and women; (3) all were headed by female program coordinators; (4) all were highly individualized, taking into account the characteristics and unique needs of the targeted groups; (5) the programs sustained themselves only through constant struggle on the part of program directors; and (6) feelings about the shift away from a feminist orientation ranged from resigned support to outright criticism. Detailed program descriptions, the interview schedule, a program evaluation checklist, and references are included. (GFW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325168

COMMUNITY COLLEGE REENTRY PROGRAMS: WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD

A field study project prepared by:

JULIA R. BROOTKOWSKI

U.C. DAVIS

M. Ed. Program

June 1989

JC 900567

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Brootkowski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"The entry of women into education proved important but insufficient; Wollstonecraft and successive feminists in the 19th century who argued for it had good reason. Education has been one of the few resources that women have been able to use to free themselves from the constraints of the traditional role."

M. Stacey & M. Price
"Women, Power & Politics"

INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that the composition of students on college campuses today is diverse - in ethnicity, by race, socio-economic status and age, reflecting our society in general, in the 1980's. In California, this student diversity is especially evident at the community college level where "the Community Colleges are the principal point of entry to postsecondary education for the greatest number and variety of Californians seeking instruction in the liberal arts and sciences, technology, vocational skills, English as a Second Language, and basic skills remediation." (Challenge of Change, p.5). Reentry women are a growing part of these numbers. Females comprise 56.7% of the total community college enrollment (California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office). The 106 California Community Colleges enroll over one million students, and the returning or non-traditional students (aged 25 years or older) comprise 57.1% of the total student population (California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office). What can these returning students expect from institutions which have traditionally educated only recent high school graduates and an occasional older adult in a night school course?

The changes which need to be made by community colleges to adapt to today's student have finally been recognized and "named", but have not yet been implemented. Much has been written and said about the need for new policies which would serve part-time,

older students whose home and family responsibilities make their college experience different from the traditional 18 to 22-year-old population (Evans, 1985; Rose, 1975; Ackell, 1982; Tittle and Denker, 1980; and others). These include policies dealing with admissions (special recruitment efforts), financial aid (aid for part-time students, crisis loans, part-time job referrals), curriculum (women's studies, basic math and writing, how to study and take notes), scheduling (evening/weekend course hours), course requirements (life experience credit) and other student services (child care facilities, social functions). How will these new policies be implemented? What role will reentry programs play in the development and maintenance of these new policies and programs?

In response to recent concerns regarding the state of higher education in California, especially the mission and quality of education at the community colleges, the Legislature in 1984 commissioned a review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. The original plan was adopted in 1960 in order to clearly state the agenda for California's system of postsecondary education; it was reviewed by a Legislative Joint Committee in 1973. In the current report, California Community College Reform, the following statement appears in the section Missions and Functions, "...we affirm that excellent student services programs (including financial aid, personal counseling, health counseling, career counseling and placement, EOPS, handicapped services and tutorial services) must be understood as an essential and

important part of the Community Colleges' capacity to perform their functions and meet their goals." Community college reentry programs can provide all of the above student services for the reentry student and yet administrative support for these programs is typically weak and inconsistent. Will these recommendations made recently by the California legislature improve the status of these support services? How will these recommendations affect reentry programs?

A look at the history and background of reentry programs provides some insight into their nature today. Beginning in the 1960's and reaching a peak in the 1970's, in response to the second wave of feminism and the rise of the over 25-year-old college student, programs that dealt with this population were taking shape. On college campuses they were called reentry programs, in local communities they formed a part of the women's center or similar community organization, and less formally, in women's living rooms they appeared as consciousness-raising groups. There was no particular format or precedent for what happened during this period. The need was felt and the response was generated in the form of a myriad of programs designed for displaced homemakers, low income women, women seeking a new career or a first career. They had names like "Second Wind" and "Second Chance" or "PROBE" (Potential Reentry Opportunities in Business and Education) and "FACET" (Female Access to Careers in Engineering Technology).

Some of these programs are still in existence today, albeit with a slightly different agenda resulting from experience and a fair share of successes and failures, but with their basic goal intact: that of achieving equal educational and occupational opportunities for women in our society. What can these programs expect in the way of support from our local, state, and federal lawmakers?

It is clear that the time has come when the issue of educational equity needs to be taken seriously. How else can we reach the goal of providing "every Californian the opportunity to further develop and realize his or her intellectual, emotional and vocational potential."? (California Community College Reform, 1986, p. 4). Reentry programs are part of the answer.

QUESTION

It is important to know how reentry programs will survive the next 20 years; important for the students, the programs, and the state of postsecondary education in California. To discover what kind of future reentry programs face, I focused my research on three areas, using three distinct reentry programs as case studies. These areas are:

1. The history of the program (where it had been); how and why it started; what changes it had gone through since it began;
2. The current state of the program (where it is now); what contributed to its present success; what problems were the programs experiencing;
3. The direction in which the program was moving; what factors would affect the future of the program.

Most of the literature recognizes the increasing need for programs which serve reentry students. Indeed most deal with how these programs should be organized and developed, not whether or not there is a need for them (Tittle and Denker, 1980; Astin, 1976; Evans, 1985; Rose, 1975). The fact that since 1977 there have been more women than men enrolled in community colleges all across the country (Elovson, 1980) reinforces this need. Tittle and Denker state that "research and theory indicate that there will be a sustained need for programs for returning women" (p. 69). The California community colleges themselves have identified this need in pledging their commitment to the vital support services critical to the success of disadvantaged groups and women (Challenge of Change).

More specifically, the literature on reentry programs revealed the following: 1) the programs which had been in existence since the early 1970's had changed dramatically; 2) there was no "typical" reentry program, each one was extremely individualistic in both organization and function; and 3) financial and administrative support for reentry programs was usually inconsistent, ranging from total to non-existent.

The changes the programs had undergone were of interest to me since I wanted to discover how or if these changes contributed to equitable educational opportunities for women. Also, I felt that the changes themselves could explain, in part, why some programs had stayed alive and were successful, which was part of my research question.

Since very few of these programs had been institutionalized at any point in their history, they were required to change periodically and adapt to the current environment of the host institution. Was this an advantage or a disadvantage?

Each program developed its own particular shape and identity because each institution varied as to the amount and type of administrative support, available funding, number of faculty, staff and student advocates, and a number of outside influences. What would be the trade offs if these programs were to be formalized and standardized?

PROCEDURES

A case study research methodology was used to satisfy my intention of conducting a descriptive study. Also, it fit the criteria for being the "preferred strategy when 'how' or 'why' questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context." (Yin, p. 14) My original plan was to conduct an in-depth case study of <u>one</u> successful community college reentry program, to interview students, faculty, staff, and administrators at that college, and to write up a case history of the program over the last 15 years. However, as I proceeded with my study, I began to feel the limitations of choosing only one program. First, there was the homogeneity of one program's population; then, there was the realization that the individuality of a single program might create too narrow a view of reentry programs, and also the fact that I could learn much more about program management, in general, if I included more than one in my study. (This does not take into account the expert advice I received from my committee members!)

I have, therefore, included three programs in my study, chosen for their longevity (all have been in existence since the early 1970's), their variety in geographic location (one urban, one suburban, one rural), their difference in student population (low-income and ethnically diverse, middle class white, and lower

& working class white) and their reputation in community college circles for being successful.

The questions on the interview guide covered the subjects' connection with the program, a history of their affiliation with the college, the amount and type of support from the administration, their view of the changes they have witnessed in the program and in what direction they saw the program heading. The interviews took from 45 minutes to several hours. Most of them were tape recorded and transcribed as soon as possible after they were completed.

Following is a description of each college and its reentry program.

DE ANZA COLLEGE

De Anza College is located in Cupertino, California, just south of the San Francisco Bay Area, within the boundaries of Silicon Valley. The campus is well-kept and peaceful, the buildings reflecting Spanish-style architecture in keeping with the history of the surrounding area. De Anza has been in existence for 21 years and currently enrolls approximately 16,312 day students and 13,856 evening students; there are more women than men attending both day and evening classes. Asians represent the largest ethnic group on campus and the average age for all students is 31.89.

De Anza's reentry program is called RENEW and is staffed by a former De Anza reentry student who was a student volunteer for the program in 1972 and stayed on to become full-time staff assistant. In March, I met with the staff assistant at her office in the Learning Center on campus. At that time, she gave me the names of several faculty members to contact who were involved with the program. However, she was reluctant to give out the names of current or former reentry students (in order to protect their privacy), so I made an arrangement with one of the faculty members to give several of her students my name in order that they might contact me, which they did. In June, I returned to speak with several faculty members involved with the reentry program. One was a psychology professor who currently teaches "Psychology of Women", a core course in the RENEW program, and former Faculty Senate President; a sociology professor who teaches "Sociology of Women and Men"; and the Coordinator of Institutional Research at the college. I also conducted a telephone interview with a member of the English Department and Women's Studies faculty member. I briefly spoke to a woman who was a former counselor for the Women in Transition program, and the Child Development Center Director, as these were people who were involved with reentry women on campus, although not through RENEW directly.

THE PROGRAM:

The reentry program at De Anza began as the Women's Re-Entry Educational Program (WREP) in the summer of 1970, an experimental

program funded by the Vocational Education Act of 1968. Its original purpose was to:

> recruit adult women with limited educational backgrounds, low incomes, and/or representative of minority cultures,
>
> introduce these women to the college environment, and
>
> determine how the college could best meet their educational needs.

By Spring of 1973, 348 women had completed at least one full quarter of study through the program and plans to expand the program were underway. With increased demand for the program, the problems encountered were: 1) the need for continued funding, 2) the need for more staff members, and 3) concrete plans for the future of the program. During this time, WREP served as a model for other local community colleges, which also required staff time and energy.

Some of the forces which have contributed to major changes in the program during the past 15 years are: 1) the loss of their power and money base due to budget cutbacks following the passage of Proposition 13; 2) the switch from being a part of the academic sphere to its current position as a student service (an administrative decision which resulted in less "clout" for the program); 3) greater diversification in the program population to include men and women from all socio-economic backgrounds (the name was changed around 1979 to the Re-Entry Program, and then again in the 1980's to RENEW); 4) curriculum modification and updating to include computer literacy and other current subjects.

SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE

If De Anza can be described as a peaceful campus, San Jose City College, located approximately 10 miles away, appears to be restless. Just a glance away from the busy 280 freeway, it appeared as an unending complex of several blocks of buildings hardly distinguishable from neighboring offices and shopping areas. I located the reentry program coordinator sitting at the typewriter in the reception area of the reentry center, which also contained several other offices, and a small lounge where the coffee and tea are free to all. The coordinator has a long history of involvement with SJCC's Re-entry Program (REP) beginning in 1979 as a work-study student, working to keep the center going during some hard times in the early 1980's, to her current full-time position as coordinator. Her enthusiasm for the reentry students and her program were evident in her manner during our talk, the written information she provided, and her friendly cooperation during the interview.

She provided me with names of five faculty members who were involved with REP and I contacted them and secured appointments to talk with four of them during November.

The interview guide I used was the same as De Anza's with the questions focusing on the program changes witnessed by each of the faculty members, whose affiliation with the college ranged from 12 to 20 years.

THE PROGRAM:

The reentry program at SJCC can be traced back to 1970 when a group of college faculty and staff, the Women in Education Committee, developed an outline for an educational program for mature women students who were economically disadvantaged. They did not receive funding for their pilot program until 1973 when the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) approved a 3-year grant providing for recruitment, orientation, equipment, tutoring and social services not available at the college (Brochure, SJCC).

The students (about 35 each semester) were required to take 12 units of classes specifically outlined by the program, which covered most general education requirements. The staff included a program director, counselor, instructors, a half-time social services coordinator, and a clerical assistant. The program was evaluated each year and received praise from students, faculty and administration. After the HEW grant expired, the program was integrated into the student services program at SJCC.

The changes which occurred over the last 10 years in SJCC's reentry program (REP) were due mainly to funding shortages and changes in REP personnel. At one point, the program was run entirely by students until the program was re-funded and a full-time counselor was hired. This program began in the late 1970's as the Women's Re-entry to Education Program (WREP) and, since it

currently serves both men and women, has changed its name to the Re-Entry to Education Program.

Administrative support was seen as "for public relations purposes only" and currently favored the program due to the large number of students registered as reentry (over 300 in the Fall semester).

YUBA COLLEGE

I drove to Yuba College in Marysville on a picture-perfect Fall day. The campus is open and sprawling and I immediately felt a friendliness which was confirmed when I met the Reentry Program Coordinator. She arranged for me to have a tour of their reentry center, which was a large comfortable room with a small library and lounge area, reception area, and office space which was occupied by a student worker. The student provided information on the center's activities and services which included workshops, a periodic brown bag lunch speaker series, and a resource notebook which was kept current with a list of area services for women (i.e., social services, information hot lines, crisis center, etc.).

Yuba College lists itself as a public community college in its sixty-second year of service. There is a main campus in Marysville and four outlying centers (one at Beale Air Force Base, one in Lake County, one in Colusa, and one in Woodland). Their total enrollment is 10,275 students, made up of 2,342 full

time and 7,933 part time students. Over half are women and 37% are over the age of 30.

The coordinator suggested several faculty members with whom I might speak regarding their involvement with the reentry program, and I interviewed two of them that same day. The third faculty member was interviewed at a later date. The interviews were tape recorded using the same interview guide as for the other two colleges.

THE PROGRAM:

The impetus for what is now Yuba College's Reentry Program came from a woman counselor at the college who was committed to Affirmative Action principles. Approximately 20 years ago, she began a women's center at the college with a few faculty members who generously volunteered their time and a work-study student as her only staff person. The program received no funding and was the only program of its type in the area at that time. The women's center itself and the services offered to reentry students were eventually incorporated into the counseling aspect of the college, and like the other programs, now serves both men and women (although some of the original women's center advocates stubbornly refuse to stop calling it the women's center).

Currently, the Re-Entry Program at Yuba College is strongly supported by both the Vocational Dean and President of the college (who is a woman), which has not always been the case with

past administrators. Also, the Dean of Instruction is a woman, which has provided an awareness of, if not total support for, the program. The Re-Entry Program has recently received funds specially earmarked for a gender equity program, including workshops on sexual harassment and gender bias in the classroom (including curriculum, textbooks, faculty awareness, etc.).

FINDINGS/DISCUSSION

In looking at these three community college reentry programs, there are many similarities in each stage of their development. Even without specific guidelines for reentry programs, such as those available for other student services, i.e., EOPS or a counseling center, they have much in common including their tentative beginnings, their continuing struggle to keep the program alive, and an optimistic hope for their future survival.

Historically, the programs all began at about the same time (late 1960's), when the country was favorably disposed towards women and minorities and affirmative action was in vogue. They took shape as either a women's center or educational outreach program for women, with a specific target population in mind (i.e., low income women, displaced homemakers, minority women, single mothers, or a combination of these). There was a definite feminist orientation to their organization, as evidenced by the target populations, the leadership (all women), the absence of local funding or any funding (two of the programs received federal funding to start their programs and one no funding at all), and the overriding concern for the welfare of the women they served.

It was a struggle to obtain most things for the programs: physical space, equipment, staff, money; then it was a struggle to keep them. One of the reentry program directors came back from summer break only to find that their office had been

promised to someone else on campus and no provisions made for relocation. They were finally allowed to keep their office space only because she persisted and managed to talk the administrators into it. This was a common problem for each of the programs; the constant need to fight for the program's existence. It appeared to be a matter of legitimation. How could a program that was run by women and served only women be taken seriously by the administration? However, they obtained a toehold in the college's organization of student services, and because they did not lack for students, they could not be entirely dismissed.

Visiting each of the reentry centers now, the first and most visible characteristic is the presence of a dedicated, supportive, female program coordinator. In all cases, their dedication to the reentry student was apparent from the amount of time given to the job over and above regular work hours. They enthusiastically spoke of the strides which had been made over the years and also of the difficulties they encountered in motivating support for the program.

Traditionally, the coordinator found ways to keep the program going even during times of little or no financial support and was outspoken in her advocacy for the program. In one case, the coordinator was the only paid staff person in the reentry center, and counted on student volunteers to assist with programs and workshops, the clerical work, and counseling students! All told the same story of part-time clerical help or no help at all;

times when support lagged and they ran the program single-handedly; doing without basic supplies and office equipment.

The coordinator was joined in her efforts by a small, but loyal group of faculty members who either served on an advisory board and/or taught the Women's Studies courses or attended reentry-sponsored events when their schedules permitted. There was a second group of faculty members who stayed further in the background, and either had once been quite involved with reentry issues but now no longer had the time, or could be counted on from time to time to assist with one project or another. This group usually had other issues that they considered more important (curriculum concerns, a political agenda at the college, or departmental troubles), but could be relied on to some degree for their support.

Generally, there was some backing by the current administration although this support was perceived to be somewhat undependable by both the program director / coordinator and the faculty. One coordinator stated that it just depended on who the current college president was and what his/her personal feelings were toward the program that determined how much support they received from the college. Several faculty members mentioned that the political popularity of a program or course was what determined the administrative backing for it, and right now reentry was popular because of the changing demographics of California. Another faculty member stated that the support needed to come

from the top down and should start with the Community College Chancellor's Office in Sacramento. However, this situation of tenuous backing had been going on since the programs began.

The programs were highly individualized and provided specifically for the needs of the students they served. For example, the program that served low-income women took their situation into account when arranging activities (i.e, times and places that were convenient for students who depended on public transportation or had child care concerns) and the program that was located in an area surrounded by high technology businesses offered special assistance and encouragement for women to enter non-traditional occupations.

An important consideration mentioned by several people was the fact that the reentry center gave the students a place of their own, and provided a solidarity among the students which contributed to their success in college.

The issue of full-time vs. part-time faculty posed a problem for the reentry programs. Since the majority of the faculty supporters had part-time status at the college, there was a lack of continuity for the programs and sporadic attendance at reentry functions. One instructor spent as little as 4 hours per week at one particular campus. Also, the attitude of some of the male faculty members towards older women students caused these students to turn to the reentry counselor for support.

Unfortunately, this problem did not seem to be something that would be resolved in the near future since it involved a change in attitude and a subsequent change in an entrenched behavior. One faculty member jokingly suggested that everything be put on hold until the "old boys" retired.

One of the major changes that the programs have witnessed is the shift from a feminist orientation as a women's program or center to one that accommodates both men and women. There were mixed feelings about this development, ranging from resigned support to outright criticism. While some of the respondents saw a need for a program that also served men, they did not want to see the women's center become coed as they felt there was still a great need for a program that focused on meeting the special requirements of women students (e.g., elimination of sex bias in the classroom, equal opportunities in career training and transfer programs, sexual harassment information).

It almost seemed a contradiction to note that the majority of the respondents said they had seen the program grow within the last 3-5 years, but the underlying reasons for the growth caused them concern. Most were not happy that the centers had changed their names, dropping the word women from them and changing the focus of the program in the process. Although they felt they could count on more funding in the future, they felt it might be for the wrong reasons (political rather than genuine concern for the program).

CONCLUSIONS

The community college reentry programs which I studied do not appear to be able to sustain themselves without the stubborn and persistent effort of the program leader and a few loyal faculty and administrative supporters. The fickle political environment surrounding programs which cater to the needs of a special population make their existence tenuous at best. The programs have survived the past two decades because of the determination of a small group of people who saw them not as superfluous women's centers or as a gimmick to increase enrollment, but as critical stepping stones to a better way of life for many women.

I think these programs will continue to keep their toehold in the community college structure. However, I do not feel the conditions for their growth are favorable. The institutions which house them are slow-moving and have failed in the past to live up to promises made for equal educational opportunities for all. That these programs are still around is a credit to the hard-working, dedicated people who fought for their survival every step of the way.

It has been argued that when the majority of students are non-traditional students, then student services will be modified to serve the needs of the majority student population. Unfortunately, the power of numbers is not always sufficient to change accepted and traditional ways of doing things. The post-secondary educational system in California is one of the largest

in the country, and it will take time, effort, and perhaps a crisis to make such a structural change.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I initially received the impression from discussions with reentry professionals and also from some of the literature (mainly articles dealing with the issue from a feminist or women's studies perspective, e.g., Vaughan & Assoc., 1983, chap. 3; Zwerling, 1986, chap. 7) that the focus of the reentry issue should be on a time in the near future when reentry programs would be a thing of the past because institutions would be responding to the needs of the soon-to-be majority of students, namely the non-traditional reentry students. My first instinct was to use this line of reasoning as the direction for my study.

However, once this wave of optimism passed and I got my feet back on the ground, I realized that at the present rate of progress, the term "near future" was relative and would probably not occur much before my retirement. This led me to a more conservative view of the situation which did not preclude a long-range vision of how things should be, but put more emphasis on the short-range condition of reentry programs.

This is the philosophy, therefore, underlying the following recommendations for the success and survival of community college reentry programs in the future.

Recommendations for the State of California:

1. Implement the recommendations put forth in "The Challenge of Change", the report generated by the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education.

2. Appoint a liaison between the Chancellor's Office in Sacramento and the community colleges specifically to facilitate the implementation process.

3. Provide stable funding for reentry programs. The programs in my study were funded by the Vocational Education Act, even though they began as women's centers and the women were not necessarily pursuing a strictly vocational program at the college. This arrangement limits the scope of the program and sends the message that perhaps women do not need an education or a career, but merely a semi-skilled job.

Recommendations for the community colleges:

1. Provide release time for faculty members interested in working with the reentry program.

2. Make the reentry program a priority in terms of administrative support and allocation of funds.

Recommendations for the reentry programs:

1. Focus on the main goal of the program and organize the program to meet that goal. Each program is unique in terms of its population and their needs. Discover the needs of your particular population and keep them in mind.

2. Perform a self-examination in order to improve services and programs for the reentry students. (See Appendix C)

3. Keep detailed records of the number of students served, programs offered, and evaluations of your program. These can provide strong support for justification of your program.

4. Join a network of reentry professionals (e.g., CARE, California Advocates for ReEntry Education). This provides invaluable moral support and an exchange of ideas and problem-solvers with others in your profession.

SUMMARY

COLLEGE and Years in Existence	LOCATION	ENROLLMENT INFORMATION					PROGRAM Date Begun	STAFF P/T *	STAFF F/T	ADMIN SUPPORT	FUNDING SOURCE
		Total No.	Female %	Male %	Over 25-yrs old %	Non-White %					
DeAnza 22 yrs	Cupertino	26,513	53.6	46.4	58.2	34.8	1970	0	1	Yes	District funds
San Jose City 68 yrs	San Jose	10,309	49.3	50.7	61.7	49.5	1970	3	1	Yes	Voc.Ed. funds
Yuba 62 yrs	Marysville	8,683	61.9	38.1	62.7	20.4	1969	2	1	Yes	Voc.Ed. funds

* Less than 100% time

INTERVIEW GUIDE

COLLEGE:

DATE:

TIME:

INTERVIEWEE:

TITLE/DEPT.:

PHONE NO.:

What is your connection with the Re-Entry Program?

How long have you been teaching/working at this college:

What changes have you observed in the re-entry program? (enrollment, curriculum, support services, emphasis, etc.)

Is the administration at this college supportive of the program?

Do you see the program growing, not growing, staying the same?

Faculty/Student referrals?

APPENDIX B

EVALUATING COMMITMENT TO RETURNING WOMEN:

A Checklist for Institutions

Does this institution have the following provisions designed specifically for returning women?

Financial Aid
Loans
Scholarships
Part-time job referrals
Crisis loans
A survey of financial needs and financial services

Special Services
Recruitment Program
Accessible course locations
Evening and weekend hours for:
- Courses
- Academic advising
- Counseling
- Financial aid
- Registration

Complete course cycle scheduled for evening and weekend hours
Life experience credit
A child care facility
Referral to child care services
Social functions for returning women
Newsletter
Athletic functions and events

Organizational Responsibility
Representation on the Board of Trustees
Designated responsibility to upper-level administrator
A specified location or center
Single-sex and mixed-sex activities
A paid director of the program
Budget support from operating funds
Periodic program evaluation
A mechanism for changing administration and faculty attitudes

Curriculum
Women's Studies
Speed reading courses
Note-taking, writing courses
Basic mathematics courses
Basic science courses

Counseling
Orientation sessions
Professional Staff
Vocational Testing
Time management sessions
Life planning sessions
Peer counseling

Source: Tittle and Denker

APPENDIX C

REFERENCES

Ackell, Edmund F. (1982 Spring). "Adapting the University to Adult Students: A Developmental Perspective", OECC News, 4-6.

American Council on Education. (1987). "The New Agenda of Women for Higher Education". Special Report.

Astin, Helen S. (Ed.) (1976). Some Action of Her Own:The Adult Woman and Higher Education. Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Co.

Beaumont, John A. (1969 April). "The Broadened Scope of Vocational Education". American Vocational Journal.

Belenky, Mary Field, Clinchy, Blythe McVicker, Goldberger, Nancy Rule, and Tarule, Jill Mattuck. (1986). Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Boone, Edgar J. (1985). Developing Programs in Adult Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bose, Christine E., and Priest-Jones, Janet. (1980). The Relationship Between Women's Studies, Career Development, and Vocational Choice. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office, Research and Analysis Unit. (1988). Report on Enrollment, Fall 1987. Report 88-7.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B. (1982). The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. (1986 March). The Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges. Sacramento: State of California.

Cossey, Beatrice (Ed.) (1973). DeAnza College Women's Re-Entry Educational Program: A Review:1971-1973. Foothill Community College District.

Cross, K. Patricia. (1981). Adults as Learners: Increasing Participation and Facilitating Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deutscher, Irwin. (1973). What We Say, What We Do: Sentiments and Acts. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman & Co.

Elovson, Allana. (1980). Women's Studies in the Community College. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Evans, Nancy J. (Ed.) (1985). Facilitating the Development of Women, New Directions for Student Services Series. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Fisher-Thompson, Jeanne, and Kuhn, Julie A. (1981). "Re-Entry Women: Relevant Statistics", Field Evaluation Draft, Project on the Status and Education of Women. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Glaser, Barney G., and Strauss, Anselm L. (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Greenberg, Elinor, O'Donnell, Kathleen M. & Bergquist, William (Eds.). (1980 November 29). Educating Learners of All Ages. New Directions for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Hersh, Blanche Glassman. (1980). Re-Entry Women Involved in Women's Studies. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Hu, Michael. (1985). "Determining the Needs and Attitudes of Non-Traditional Students, College and University, 60, 201-208.

Iovacchini, Eric V., Hall, Linda M., & Hengstler, Dennis D. (1985). "Going Back to College: Some Differences Between Adult Students and Traditional Students, College and University, 61, 43-54.

Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. (1986). California Community College Reform. Final Report.

Lofland, John and Lofland, Lyn H. (1984). Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis. 2nd Ed. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Pirnot, Karen A. (1987). "Reentry Women: A Longitudinal Study of Persistence in Nontraditional Students". Journal of NAWDAC, Spring, 20-26.

Pucinski, Roman C. (1967 October). "New Rights for Women", American Vocational Journal.

Rose, Clare (Ed.) (1975). Meeting Women's New Educational Needs, New Directions for Higher Education Series No. 11. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Steltenpohl, Elizabeth, and Shipton, Jane. (1986). "Facilitating a Successful Transition to College for Adults". Journal of Higher Education. Ohio State University Press.

Thorpe, Mary. (1988). Gender Equity Coordinator's Handbook: A Technical Assistance Resource for California Community Colleges. Thorpe,Hendrix and Associates.

Tittle, Carol Kehr, and Denker, Elenor Rubin. (1980). Returning Women Students in Higher Education: Defining Policy Issues. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Vaughan, George B. (1988). "The Community College Mission", AACJC Journal, Feb/Mar, 25-27.

-----, and Associates. (1983). Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Yin, Robert K. (1984). Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Zwerling, L. Steven (Ed.) (1986). The Community College and Its Critics. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

DEC 7 1990